

REMARKS

In the above-mentioned Office Action, all of the pending claims, claims 1-3 and 7-10, were rejected. The claims were rejected under Section 103(a) over a 3GPP document and Tohono. And, claims 8-10 were rejected under Section 103(a) over the combination of the 3GPP document, the Tohono, and Laitinen.

Responsive to the renewed rejection of the claims under Section 103(a), the independent claims, claims 1, 7, and 8, have been amended in manners, as set forth herein, believed further to distinguish the invention of the present application over the cited combination of references.

With respect to exemplary claim 1, the claim has been amended, now further to recite the providing of a predefined order for applying system information associated with SIB IEs. The predefined order is stated to act on system information associated with an IE in an SIB 11 and then to act upon system information of an IE of an SIB 12. Claim 1 is further amended to recite the determining if a same IE type is included in each of the SIB 11 and SIB 12. And, the method is further amended to recite that the responding to a determination that the same IE type is not included in each SIB by acting upon the system information associated with SIB IEs while refraining from using the predefined order. And, the claim is further amended to recite that the responding to a determination that the same IE type is included by acting upon the system information associated with the identified same IE types according to the predefined order.

Support for the amended recitations is found in the disclosure, e.g., paragraph [0027], which states that a check is carried out to see if the same IE relating to cell information list is included in both of the SIBs; if not, then the IE is applied from an associated SIB, and otherwise, the UE is arranged to apply the IE in a defined order in which the IE from the first SIB is applied before applying the IE from the second SIB. Support for the amended recitations is also found, e.g., in paragraph [0028], which states that the IE from SIB 11 is applied before a corresponding IE from SIB 12.

The Applicants assert that none of the references, in any combination, disclose the invention recited in the independent claims. Accordingly, the rejection of the claims is respectfully traversed.

In the rejection of the claims, the Examiner acknowledged that the 3GPP document fails to disclose arranging a UE to apply certain received information elements in a defined order and, if the same information elements are related to at least one cell information list, then reading and acting upon this system information according to the defined order, wherein the defined order comprises reading and acting upon the system information of the SIB 11 and then reading and acting upon the system information of the SIB 12. The Examiner, however, relied upon Tohono for disclosing this feature.

The Applicants specifically traverse the Examiner's reliance upon Tohono for disclosing acting upon the system information in the recited manners in response to determination of if a same IE type is included in each of the SIB 11 and SIB 12.

While the Examiner states that Tohono discloses specifically arranging a UE to apply certain received information elements in a defined order, the Applicants assert that Tohono not only fails to disclose, or suggest, the recited, predefined order but, further, fails to disclose, or suggest, the responding to a determination that the same IE type is not included in each SIB by acting upon the system information associated with the SIB IEs while refraining from using the predefined order. Furthermore, and significantly, Tohono fails to disclose determining whether a same IE type is included in each of the SIB 11 and SIB 12. And, therefore, Tohono further fails to disclose acting upon the system information in the recited manner in response to the determination.

The Examiner acknowledged that the 3GPP document fails to disclose this feature. And, Laitinen, cited in combination to reject claims 8-10, was cited merely for showing a microprocessor running software to carry out operations. This reference was neither cited for showing, nor appears to disclose, the invention recited now in amended claims 1, 7, and 8.

The remaining dependent claims, which include all of the recitations of their respective parent claims, are believed to be patentably distinguishable over the cited combinations for same reasons as those just-given with respect to their parent claims.

Accordingly, in light of the foregoing, independent claims 1, 7, and 8, as now-presented, and the remaining dependent claims dependent thereon, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reexamination and reconsideration for allowance for the claims is respectfully requested. Such early action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Robert H. Kelly /

Robert H. Kelly
Registration No. 33,922

KELLY & KRAUSE, L.P.
6600 LBJ Freeway, Suite 275
Dallas, Texas 75240
Telephone: (214) 446-6684
Fax: (214) 446-6692
robert.kelly@kelly-krause.com